

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-4, 6, 9, 21-25 and 27-28 were rejected; claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 26 and 29 were objected to as being dependent on rejected base claims, and claims 10-20 and 30-33 were allowed. By the present Response, claims 1, 21, 27 and 28 are amended. Claims 2, 26 and 29 are cancelled. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1, 3-25, 27-28 and 30-33 will be pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Claim objections due to informalities

In the Office Action, claims 1, 21, 27 and 28 were objected to because of certain informalities. Claims 1, 21, and 27 have been amended to obviate the objections raised in the Office Action. In particular, claims 1, 21 and 27 have been amended to include paragraph indentations for easier understanding. Claim 28 has been amended to correct the informality pointed out by the Examiner. No new matter has been added. Thus, reconsideration and allowance of amended claims are requested.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to because of certain informalities in reference characters. Applicants respectfully submit that the alignment pin as recited in claim 27 is illustrated in Fig. 6 and indicated by reference numeral 78. No new matter has been added. Review and acceptance of the replacement drawing is requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 3-6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Carlson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,701,233, hereinafter "Carlson"). Claims 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tai et al. (U.S. Patent 5,043,794, hereinafter "Tai").

Claims 1 and 21 are independent. All of the recited claims are believed to be patentable as cited below.

Claim 1 and the Claims Depending Therefrom.

The Examiner indicated that claim 2 would be allowable if written in independent form. By the present response, independent claim 1 is amended to include the recitations of claim 2. Therefore, claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Further, claims 3-6 and 9 depend directly or indirectly on independent claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3-6 and 9 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim, as well as for the subject matter they separately recite.

Claim 21 and the Claims Depending Therefrom.

The Examiner indicated that claim 26 would be allowable if written in independent form. By the present response, independent claim 21 is amended to include the recitations of claim 26. Therefore, claim 21 is in condition for allowance. Further, claims 22-23 depend directly or indirectly on independent claim 21. Accordingly, claims 3-6 and 9 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim, as well as for the subject matter they separately recite.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action summarizes claim 24 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Tai and further in view of Nishiuma et al. (U.S. Patent 5,225,709, hereinafter "Nishiuma"). The Office Action further summarizes claim 25 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Tai and further in view of Farnworth et al. (U.S. Patent 5,893,765, hereinafter "Farnworth"). The Office Action further summarizes claims 27 and 28 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable Nakano, Tsuyoshi. (U.S. Patent 4,733,461, hereinafter "Nakano") and further in view of Tamarkin (U.S. Patent 6,049,467, hereinafter "Tamarkin")

Claims 24 and 25 rejected under this section all depend directly from independent claims 21 as discussed above. Consequently, the dependent claims are believed to be patentable both by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim, as well as for the subject matter they separately recite. Reconsideration and allowance of all of the dependent claims on this basis are requested.

Claim 27 and the Claim Depending Therefrom.

The Examiner had indicated that claim 29 would be allowable if written in independent form. By the present response, independent claim 27 is amended to include the recitations of claim 29. Therefore, claim 27 is in condition for allowance. Further, claim 26 depends directly on independent claim 27. Accordingly, claim 27 is allowable by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim, as well as for the subject matter it separately recites.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/12/2005

Pg
Patrick S. Yoder
Reg. No. 37,479
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545